

Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 8-9, and 15-16, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0093789 A1, hereinafter referred to as “Zimmerman”), in view of Naidoo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,185,282 B1, hereinafter referred to as “Naidoo”), in view of Englert (U.S. Publication No. 2006/0082690 A1).

Claims 3-7, 10-14, and 17-20, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0093789 A1, hereinafter referred to as “Zimmerman”), in view of Naidoo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,185,282 B1, hereinafter referred to as “Naidoo”), in view of Englert (U.S. Publication No. 2006/0082690 A1), and further in view of Ganzer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,430).

It is respectfully asserted that none of Zimmerman, Naidoo, Englert, or Ganzer, alone or in combination, disclose a television signal receiving apparatus:

“wherein, responsive to a first depression of said single user interface button when said television signal receiver is in an “off” state and said emergency alert function is activated, said processing means perform steps comprising turning said television signal receiver to an “on” state and presenting information based on said emergency alert signals, and wherein, responsive to a second depression of said single user input button, said processing means cause said television signal receiving apparatus to be returned to an “off” state,”

as described in claim 1.

Zimmerman discloses “systems for monitoring broadcast content and generating notification signals as a function of subscriber profiles and methods of operating the same. According to an exemplary embodiment, a monitoring system is introduced that is capable of identifying special event content within a plurality of broadcast content streams, each of the plurality of broadcast content streams having detectable content attributes. The

monitoring system is operable to (i) sense a content change within at least one of the plurality of broadcast content streams as a function of the detectable content attributes, (ii) detect the special event content broadcast within the at least one of the plurality of broadcast content streams as a function of the sensed content change, and (iii) selectively generate a notification signal as a function of the detected special event content and a subscriber profile.” (Zimmerman Abstract)

As admitted in the Office Action, “Zimmerman is silent in teaching the use of a single user input button for receiving tactile user inputs to control said emergency alert function.” (Office Action, page 3) Furthermore, the portions of Zimmerman cited in relation to this claim element fail to describe turning the receiver on and presenting emergency information on a first press and returning to a standby mode on a second press. (Zimmerman, [0083] and [0068]) In Zimmerman, a transition from “off” or “standby” to “on” with regard to emergency function is triggered by a “special event detecting controller,” not by user intervention. (Zimmerman, [0083]) Thus, Zimmerman fails to disclose a television signal receiving apparatus “wherein, responsive to a first depression of said single user interface button when said television signal receiver is in an “off” state and said emergency alert function is activated, said processing means perform steps comprising turning said television signal receiver to an “on” state and presenting information based on said emergency alert signals, and wherein, responsive to a second depression of said single user input button, said processing means cause said television signal receiving apparatus to be returned to an “off” state,” as described in claim 1.

Naidoo teaches that “an integrated home health system includes a television-based patient station, a first provider station for providing telemedicine or other healthcare services to a patient located at the patient station, a second provider station for providing caregiver services to the patient, a third provider station for providing emergency response services to the patient and a system management station coupled together by a data network. In addition to various management operations performed on behalf of the integrated home health system, the system management station is further configured to provide various home health services to the patient located at the patient station, either alone, or in

conjunction with one or more of the first, second and/or third provider stations.” (Naidoo Abstract)

The Office Action asserts that “Naidoo discloses the use of a button as a human interface of a emergency response unit (Column 18 lines 34-37).” However, Naidoo does not disclose, nor does the Office Action assert that it discloses, a single button emergency alert interface which will turn a receiver on and present alert information upon a first press and return the receiver to an off state upon a second press. Therefore, Naidoo, like Zimmerman, fails to disclose a television signal receiving apparatus “wherein, responsive to a first depression of said single user interface button when said television signal receiver is in an “off” state and said emergency alert function is activated, said processing means perform steps comprising turning said television signal receiver to an “on” state and presenting information based on said emergency alert signals, and wherein, responsive to a second depression of said single user input button, said processing means cause said television signal receiving apparatus to be returned to an “off” state,” as described in claim 1.

Englert teaches an “apparatus such as a television signal processing apparatus provides a means to control power dissipation by high speed signal processing circuitry associated with tuners while continuing to receive auxiliary data such as administrative data, guide data, or emergency alert notifications. According to an exemplary embodiment, the television signal processing apparatus comprises a first tuner for tuning a first signal when the television signal processing apparatus is in a first mode of operation and where power is removed from the first tuner during a second mode of operation, a second tuner for tuning a second signal when the television signal processing apparatus is in a first mode of operation and a second mode of operation,; wherein power is applied to the second tuner for a portion of the time the television signal processing apparatus is in the second mode of operation and the portion of the time the television signal processing apparatus is in the second mode of operation is less than percent of the time the television signal processing apparatus is in the second mode of operation.” (Englert Abstract)

Englert does not disclose, nor does the Office Action assert that it discloses, a single button emergency alert interface which will turn a receiver on and present alert information upon a first press and return the receiver to an off state upon a second press. Therefore, Englert, like Zimmerman and Naidoo, fails to disclose a television signal receiving apparatus “wherein, responsive to a first depression of said single user interface button when said television signal receiver is in an “off” state and said emergency alert function is activated, said processing means perform steps comprising turning said television signal receiver to an “on” state and presenting information based on said emergency alert signals, and wherein, responsive to a second depression of said single user input button, said processing means cause said television signal receiving apparatus to be returned to an “off” state,” as described in claim 1.

Ganzer teaches that a “geographically specific emergency alert system includes a code generator unit in which geographic areas to be alerted and types of severity of alerts are selected and code strings generated to represent the affected areas and alert types selected. The code strings are broadcast by modulating the audio carrier of a television signal and received on receiver units positioned in areas within the broadcast market of a television station providing the alerting service. Location codes are entered into the receiver units by the users according to the areas in which the receiver units are used. When an alert is broadcast, each receiver unit decodes a location code string in the signal. If it matches that set on the receiver, an alert code string is decoded to activate a alarm devices connected to the receiver, such as an audible alarm generator, LED, etc., in accordance with the type or severity of alert that was broadcast.” (Ganzer Abstract)

Ganzer does not disclose, nor does the Office Action assert that it discloses, a single button emergency alert interface which will turn a receiver on and present alert information upon a first press and return the receiver to an off state upon a second press. Therefore, Ganzer, like Zimmerman, Naidoo, and Englert, fails to disclose a television signal receiving apparatus “wherein, responsive to a first depression of said single user interface button when said television signal receiver is in an “off” state and said emergency alert function is activated, said processing means perform steps comprising turning said television signal receiver to an “on” state and presenting information based on said emergency alert signals,

and wherein, responsive to a second depression of said single user input button, said processing means cause said television signal receiving apparatus to be returned to an “off” state,” as described in claim 1.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Zimmerman, Naidoo, Englert, or Ganzer, alone or in combination, that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that independent claims 8 and 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are dependent from allowable independent claim 1, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner’s rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant’s representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Comarty/

By:

Brian J. Cromarty
Reg. No. 64018
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
April 6, 2010